

bending [position] line of said baseline, said third left set tooth is bent along a third bending [position] line of said baseline and said fourth right set tooth is bent along a fourth bending [position] line;

said pitches being [variable] different from one another along said baseline among said first set tooth, said second set tooth, said third set tooth and said fourth set tooth;

wherein [the] respective lengths of said first bending [position] line, said second bending [position] line, said third bending [position] line and said fourth bending [position] line [being] are substantially equal to each other; and

wherein further said first bending [position] line, said second bending [position] line, said third bending [position] line and said fourth bending [position] line are located on [the same] a single baseline.

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 21, 1999 has been carefully considered and in response thereto, this application has been amended in a manner which it is believed places it in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; rejected claims 8-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being obvious over Ronan et al.; and rejected claims 8-10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida et al.

The rejection stated that it was "not at all clear" what one of the claim features is. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection is based on a misinterpretation of that claim feature which the Examiner found unclear. The present amendment and the clarifying remarks below thereby address the rejection's misinterpretation and should overcome the outstanding rejections.

The amendment does not raise any new issue (as discussed below) and would require no additional consideration of the issues.

With respect to the rejection of claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite, the claims are amended only formally, to overcome the § 112 rejection and for greater clarity. "Position" is removed as redundant. No limitations are added or intended. The rejection is respectfully traversed as to the lengths of the bending lines. The rejection stated that the "length of the bending line" was not at all clear and pointed to Applicant's Fig. 1B as showing lengths contrary to the claim language. The bending lines recited in independent claims 8 and 13 are those portions of the dashed line j-j (the "baseline" of claim 9) lying *within each tooth*. In Fig. 1b the "bending length" does not include the flat-bottomed dish-shaped areas with corner radii "R ... R". Similarly, in instant Fig. 2B the semi-circles vary in the radius R to account for the varying pitch while the tooth length L along the bending line is substantially constant.

The lengths of the claimed bending lines are indicated by reference letters "L"; the Examiner is invited to note that these appear all substantially the same length in the Fig. 1B, in accordance with the specification at page 7, lines 5-11 ("by making the bending length L of the

setting and bending position j-j line in each of the set teeth ... substantially equal ... the spring back amount after setting and bending becomes substantially equal”).

The Applicant's specification explains that the present invention provides the advantages of uneven pitch but each tooth is just like the next tooth as to bending, because of the substantially constant (or equal) bending line length. This allows the teeth to be evenly set without any complication.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 8-11 and 13 under § 102 as being anticipated by Ronan. Ronan does not disclose the substantially equal-length bending lines claimed by the Applicant. The dotted line of Fig. 1, which is noted by the rejection, runs along the base of the teeth (Fig. 1); in view of Ronan's cross-sectional Figs. 4 and 5, this dotted line is also the bending line. Now considering Fig. 1 again, it is clear that the lengths of the bending lines *within the teeth* are uneven; they varying along with the pitch. Thus, Ronan's drawing fails to disclose or even suggest the claimed subject matter. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that it appears that the rejection is based solely on Ronan's drawing, contrary to MPEP § 2125, which states: "PROPORTIONS OF FEATURES IN A DRAWING ARE NOT EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL PROPORTIONS WHEN DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO SCALE. When the reference does not disclose that the drawings are to scale and is silent as to dimensions, arguments based on measurement of the drawing features are of little value." (emphasis in original). Insofar as the drawing might be applicable, it supports the Applicant's argument.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 8-10 and 12-13 under § 102 as being anticipated by Yoshida. Figs. 2a-2c were applied in the rejection. Yoshida does not disclose the claimed subject matter. Yoshida is concerned with the “height” of the teeth, i.e., the protrusion in the direction of the depth of the cut. The line F is the “center of the width of the saw blade”; for a circular saw the line F reduces to the center point. The line F is the reference line for the tooth heights (col. 7, lines 4-24). Yoshida nowhere discusses or even mentions the bending line, and does not show it on the figures applied by the rejection. Even though Yoshida mentions uneven pitch, it discloses no connection whatsoever to the bending of the teeth. As Yoshida neither mentions nor illustrates its bending lines, it cannot anticipate or render obvious any particular orientation of bending lines, including that recited in the Applicant’s claims, “extending in a moving direction of the band saw blade”.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection over Yoshida are respectfully requested.

As all grounds of objection and rejection have been addressed and overcome, entry of this Amendment and issuance of a Notice of Allowance of claims 8-13, as now presented, are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any questions relating to this Amendment or the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that prosecution of this application may be expedited. Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (000004.00634).

In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith and in the event that a separate petition does not accompany this response, Applicant hereby petitions under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susumu TSUJIMOTO

By: Michael D. White
Michael D. White
Reg. No. 32,795

BLANK ROME COMISKY & MCCAULEY LLP
The Farragut Building
900 - 17th Street, N.W., Ste. 1000
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 530-7400 (firm)
Facsimile: (202) 463-6915